How Fulbright Hastily Shoved the Tonkin Gulf Inquiry Under the Rug, P. 4

Maybe Nixon Can Get Him A Welfare Supplement

"I don't intend to live on $30,000 a year." *he ll not give up all outside income when he takes his*
—Electronics magnate David Packard, explaining that $30,000-a-year job as Deputy Secretary of Defense.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Now Published Bi-Weekly

VOL. XVII, NO. 1 JANUARY 13, 1969 101 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

The Need for Double Vision in the Middle East

One way to approach the Middle Eastern crisis is to recognize that Israel is an island in a hostile sea. Its only swift and sure access to the rest of the world is by air. You cannot go by train from Cairo to Tel Aviv's neighboring city Jaffa, as you still could in 1945 when I first visited Palestine, nor take a taxi from Jerusalem to Amman or from Haifa to Beirut, or to Damascus, as I still could in three memorable trips in 1947. There is no exit by land from Israel today; the sea route is slow, and in time of war rendered insecure by Soviet supplied naval vessels in the hands of the Egyptians and by the new presence of the Soviet navy itself in the Mediterranean. Only the air is Israel's open door to the rest of the world. More than any other nation today it is the child of the air age. Its swift victory in the six day war last year was a lightning victory by airpower. A major element in its balance of payments, the tourist trade, depends on the air. By air it is only a few hours from New York, London and Paris. In the days of the Romans and centuries later of the great Arab empires in North Africa and Spain, it took slow and arduous months for Jewish pilgrims and poets to reach the Holy Land. Today only a few hours separates Israel from its Jewish supporters in the outside world. Perhaps most fundamentally of all, the air alone saves Israel from the claustrophobia and despair of a nation besieged ever since its birth 20 years ago.

Israel's Jugular Vein

The new target of the Arab guerrillas is that lifeline. It is as vulnerable as a man's jugular vein. Israel's national airline, El Al, owns seven jets. When one was hi-jacked in Rome early last year and another attacked in Athens a few weeks ago, the Arab guerrillas hit Israel's most sensitive point. This was no sporadic shelling of a border settlement or even the bombing of a crowded Jerusalem market. The threat, the repercussions and the possibilities were of a far graver order. El Al is one of the few national airlines which is in the black. It would only take a few unsuccessful attacks to frighten away much of its business; what the Arab guerrillas could not do at Israel's well-guarded main airport in Lydda, they might do abroad. The next step would be attacks on other airlines which fly into Israel. I can still remember my own desperate feelings in Paris, on my way to Palestine on the eve of the 1948 war, when the airlines stopped flying into Lydda and getting there depended on a chance lift on a special Haganah plane from Geneva. To cut the air link would be to close an iron ring around Israel.

A New Kennedy-McCarthy Contest

The liberal Democratic "study" group in the House is notoriously anemic and we were not surprised by its swift defeat in a half-hearted (as ever) attempt to replace Speaker McCormack. But it was a pleasure to see Edward Kennedy unseat Long as majority whip in the Senate which has too often seemed the last stronghold of the Confederacy. Kennedy's energy, the prestige of his name and the vigor of his own machine made possible an outcome no other Senator could have achieved. His finest accolade was the sour comment from Smathers of Florida that Kennedy's victory means "the sophomores and the liberals will be running the party" and his hint that he might turn Republican. That would be an exhilarating loss. Now we wait to see what Kennedy will do with his new post. The first test will be how fully the Democrats scrutinize the records and views of the Nixon Cabinet appointments. After the caucus, Mansfield as majority leader said that "a Senate which did not abdicate its independent constitutional responsibilities under a Democratic administration will not lay them aside under a Republican." The chesty rhetoric bears slight resemblance to the flaccid record made by the Senate under his leadership, especially in foreign policy. His actions rarely match his enlightened views. Will Mansfield and Kennedy weakly rubber-stamp the appointment, as Secretary of Defense, of Melvin Laird whose apocalyptic right-wing philosophy we called to public attention in our last issue? A Democratic Senate refused to confirm Lewis Strauss as Secretary of Commerce under Eisenhower. We believe the Senate should refuse to confirm Laird under Nixon. This is McCarthy's test, too. He declined to vote for Kennedy on the ground that the latter's victory would provide the illusion rather than the reality of a change. Was this personal pique or radical insight? The confirmation debate over Laird will provide the answer and show whether McCarthy has the mettle for a more militant alternative leadership.

It is foolish in this perspective to ask why Israel retaliated against Lebanon, its one moderate Arab neighbor and the only one which has done little or no fighting against it, the only neighboring Arab State which has protected its own Jewish minority from persecution in the blind furies unleashed by three Arab-Israeli wars. The reprisal was not against the Lebanon. It was against the Arab air lines, and—to speak frankly—the British companies which insure them and the

(Continued On Page Two)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*Continued From Page One*)

American companies which finance them. It was struck at the nerve center and main air gateway of the Arab world, the Beirut airport. It sought by damaging the Arab airlines and their financial links in London and New York to warn the aviation world that airports had best be kept safe for all nations, Israel included. These are the blunt truths of the Beirut affair, and this is a message which had best get a full debate in the air age. For airports can easily become a new and critical nerve point in all the various short-of-war struggles which afflict a cantankerous and quarrelsome mankind.

Political Victory of The Guerrillas

The price paid by Israel was a political victory for the Arab guerrilla movements. Israel has never been as isolated as it is today in the wake of its unanimous condemnation by the Security Council. The Israeli cabinet, according to reports in Israel's most respected newspaper *Haaretz,* was deeply split on the eve of the reprisal raid. Its magnitude, despite the sensational success in carrying it off without any loss of life, was bound to seem so disproportionate as to evoke condemnation. To strike at Lebanon, half Christian in population, still substantially French in culture, was bound to arouse traditional protective sympathies in the Vatican and in Paris. It would be just as well for Jewish spokesmen to keep their cool about the reactions of Pope Paul and de Gaulle, and not make more enemies. The feeling of Rome for the ancient Christian communities of the Lebanon is as natural as those of the Jews for Israel. The first point of repair should be with Lebanon, for its success in welding Christian and Moslem communities into a stable nation is a model for what must sooner or later develop in some form between Israel and the Palestinian Arabs if there is to be peace in the Middle East.

Indeed at a time when Ulster's bloody battles between Catholic and Protestant in Ireland show that even the embers of Cromwell's cruel time still smolder, Lebanon seems to be about the only place in the world (look at Belgium torn between Fleming and Walloon, and at French Canada!) where bi-national and multi-national solutions are working smoothly. Something of the sort must come in a reconstructed Palestine of Jewish and Arab states in peaceful co-existence. To bring it about Israel and the Jewish communities of the world must be willing to look some unpleasant truths squarely in the face, and to rise to heights of magnanimity which could write the finest chapter in the history of a great people.

One is to recognize that the Arab guerrillas are doing to us what our terrorists and saboteurs of the Irgun, Stern and Haganah did to the British. Another is to be willing to admit that their motives are as honorable as were ours. As a Jew, even as I felt revulsion against the terrorism, I felt it justified by the homelessness of the surviving Jews from the Nazi camps and the bitter scenes when refugee ships sank, or sank themselves, when refused admission to Palestine. The best of Arab youth feels the same way; they cannot forget the atrocities committed by us against villages like Deir Yassin, nor the uprooting of the Palestinian Arabs from their ancient homeland, for which they feel the same deep ties of sentiment as do so many Jews, however assimilated elsewhere.

We made the Palestinian Arabs homeless to make a home for our own people. That is the simple truth as history will see it, and until we make amends and resettle the refugees and create a new political framework in which Jew and Arab can live together in a new and greater Palestine there will be no

Somebody's Going To Wake Up Screaming

"'I will sleep better with Henry Kissinger in Washington,' remarked Prof. Adam Yarmolinsky. . . . 'I think it's an excellent appointment,' said Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. . . . John Kenneth Galbraith called the appointment of his friend a 'good one.'"

—New York Times *from Harvard Dec. 4 on Prof. Kissinger's appointment as Nixon's "Walt Rostow"*

"The appointment of Henry Kissinger by Richard Nixon to his critical post is very good news, say we. Say also a lot of other people, some of them unreliable judges of just what kind of a man the President ought to be listening to when it comes to foreign policy. . . . But Mr. Kissinger is somewhat a little unusual, and we choose to believe that it is this which above all commended him to the attention of Nixon: he is a realist, a patriot, he sees a problem whole, is sometimes a little dreamy on disarmament matters—but one cannot walk away from any of his books or articles, or know something about the history of his contributions to American strategic thinking, and be less than grateful for his appointment."

—*Buckley's* National Review, *December 17*

GAO More Vigilant About Poverty Program Than Mismanaged Pentagon Billions

The New Year brought two more striking examples of how our huge military establishment not only wastes money but does its best to hide the facts. An Air Force efficiency expert was stripped of his Civil Service protection after telling the Joint Economic Committee the C-5A transport was going to cost $2 billion more than had been estimated. A civilian petroleum expert was transferred from Bangkok to a routine job in Washington because he wrote Senator Proxmire about the waste of oil in Thailand. Proxmire asked the General Accounting Office to investigate and it reported bribery and forgery led to the theft of at least 5.5 million gallons in 1967.

It is important to notice that the GAO only investigated because the Senator asked it to do so, and that the report was made public by the Senator. The GAO is proving to be a lax and toothless watchdog where the military is concerned. The last Congress ordered two GAO inquiries which involve the waste of public funds. One was to determine the feasibility of uniform cost accounting in military procurement. The second was to look into the poverty program. When we checked with the GAO, we were told that "four, five, maybe six" employes were on the defense study while the poverty program inquiry involved "200 to 300" investigators. Yet the Pentagon spends close to $80 billion, the poverty program less than two.

The Pentagon's deputy liaison to the GAO feasibility study, B. B. Lynn, said in a speech last year that "if the results of our study are considered productive . . . it would be more because we succeeded in advancing the state of the art [of accounting] than because of any specific conclusion we reached as to whether or not uniform cost accounting standards are feasible." His superior, John Malloy, told us Lynn hadn't "reached any conclusions yet." But Malloy himself expected the result to be the formulation of an extensive questionnaire which would ask the industries themselves whether or not uniform cost accounting standards are feasible! This is like asking a kidnaper if he favors the Lindbergh Act.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peace. This is a tragic quarrel of brothers, requiring for its resolution that healing double vision which may at last enable each to see with pity the all too human fears and features of the Other, who is only the mirror image of ourselves, tightly embraced in hate, where love alone can free.

The Arab Refugee The No. 1 Problem

Self-pity and self-righteousness, the psychic counterparts of the siege, can only block a solution. Just as the lofty sky is Israel's physical way out, so its political and spiritual way out must be to rise to a higher plane of understanding. To do so is to clear the way for the political initiatives which can alone free it from isolation. If Israel wishes to avoid an imposed solution, then it must come forward with alternative constructive proposals of its own. These should be seen not as giving away bargaining cards in advance but as a means of preventing that polarization of sentiment in both the Jewish and Arab communities the die-hards on both sides seek, whether Arab guerrillas or military-minded Israeli. In some form or another this must involve a federated co-existence among Israel, the Palestinian Arabs and the Jordanians, with access to the sea for Jordan and the West Bank. The foundation for such a political settlement must be a major effort to end the Arab refugee problem once and for all time. To this the world Jewish community must show the same generosity we have shown our own uprooted people. So long as more than a million Palestinians live in homeless misery there will be no peace for Israel, and there should be no peace of mind for world Jewry. This is the wrong we must right.

I believe that Charles W. Yost, the American diplomat Nixon has recalled from retirement to act as the U.S. representative at the United Nations, is well suited by experience, insight and humanity to further this cause of reconciliation. I recommend his article on the 1967 war, "How It Began," in the January 1968 issue of *Foreign Affairs* and the article he wrote just before his appointment for the January, 1969, issue of *The Atlantic Monthly,* "Israel and The Arabs: The Myths That Block Peace." I agree with the broad outlines of a solution as he has outlined them. A certain hopeful convergence of forces toward a solution is visible in the November, 1967, resolution of the Security Council, the Jarring mission and in the drawing closer of the four big powers toward unified action. "Neither Israel nor the Arabs," *The Times* of London was quite right in warning Jan. 2, "can act as if they were conducting a private vendetta in a vacuum." The Middle East is not Southeast Asia. The Middle East is still the cross-roads of the world. Only Berlin could be a more dangerous place for a confrontation of the nuclear superpowers.

Both Washington and Moscow for all their rivalry are soberly aware of the dangers. If Israel and the Arabs cannot agree, some solution will have to be imposed which can allow both to leave in peace. The die-hards on both sides feel this settlement approaching, and would like to upset it with desperate action. The Beirut affair must be seen in this perspective, too. The fanatical agree only in stalling for time. But it is a myth, as Yost wrote in *The Atlantic Monthly,* to believe that time works in anyone's favor in the Middle East. "A settlement during coming months on the basis of the November resolution may still be feasible," Yost wrote. "Later it may not be. Provocation and counter-provocation may become so shocking and intolerable that compromise will be politically out of the question. If the parties cannot themselves come to a settlement, it will be high time for the UN, with Great Power backing, to take the initiative. . . . After twenty years, so many dead, so much waste and suffering, world peace more and more threatened, there is no time to lose." To this we can only say Amen.

Thirty Years Late

As one of his final acts in office, Secretary of Labor Wirtz finally issued an order requiring uranium mines to meet standards of radiation exposure first proposed in the late 1930's by the International Commission on Radiation Protection. Until now a coalition of uranium industry and military interests had blocked adoption of this international standard. Because of this 30-year delay Leo Goodman of the UAW—a tireless crusader for nuclear safety—has estimated that 6500 American miners will die of lung cancer by 1987.

At recent Labor Dept. hearings Prof. Robley Evans of MIT declared that the old standards—which allowed for 3 times as much radon gas exposure as the new level—were safe. Although Prof. Evans only identified himself as a representative of the AEC, a spokesman for Kerr-McGee later revealed that Evans has been a consultant for this company—one of the largest uranium producers in the country—since 1961! Another witness who testified against the stricter standards said that mine workers—just like everybody's maid in the Old South—tell him all the time that they'd rather risk cancer than the cold which the witness said would result from ventilated mines.

Nixon's No. 2 Man for Pentagon Calls Arms Reduction "Advantageous" To U.S. and USSR

"David Packard, deputy secretary of defense-designate in the Nixon administration said today arms reduction would be 'advantageous' to both the United States and Russia. A slow-down in the armaments race would help 'mantain stability' in the world and lower the enormous expenditures the two world powers are pouring into weaponry, Packard said. But the multi-millionaire electronics executive also told newsmen at a press conference at his firm's Page Mill Road headquarters in Palo Alto a basic balance of power must be maintained between the two countries. [The reference to "basic balance" rather than nuclear superority is noteworthy—IFS.]

"Packard, 56, said the one priority 'overriding everything else' is that 'we must do everything possible to avoid a nuclear conflagration.' He said he is deeply aware of former President Eisenhower's concern about the influence in national life exerted by the so-called military industrial complex. . . . He added he hopes a balance can be maintained between the nation's military and security requirements and the other problems confronting the country—particularly those of minorities with which Packard said, 'I have some familiarity.' Packard has been a prime mover in a local version of the Urban Coalition, in which the private sector is involved in helping to establish businesses and find jobs for minority peoples. . . .

"Packard said the new team at the Pentagon will review the antiballistic missile program, the need to update weapons and the question of whether enough research and development is being accomplished. . . . Packard said the Middle East situation is the most dangerous facing the nation now, and he said the Israeli attack on a Lebanese airport last week-end 'won't help in any way.'"

—John Keplinger, political editor of the Palo Alto, Cal., Times, Dec. 31. The wire services we saw did not carry Packard's pro-arms reduction views in this home-town interview. We reprint it here, and his reference to the Middle East, for their news value. We will comment on his appointment in a succeeding issue.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With Morse Gone, Will Gore or McCarthy Step In And Give Us The Whole Truth?

How Fulbright Hastily Shoved the Tonkin Gulf Inquiry Under the Rug

Chairman Fulbright and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have been derelict in the Tonkin Gulf affair. They have ended their investigation with an obscure release of documents on the eve of the Christmas holidays, when it was certain to attract as little attention as possible. The basic question was not past scandal but wiser action in a future crisis. It involved two interrelated problems in what Pentagon *argot* calls command and control. One was the President's control over our vast military and intelligence network. The other was the control of Congress over sufficient reliable information when asked to share responsibility. Command and control broke down in both. The White House acted on dubious information and the Congress on serious falsifications by the White House and Pentagon. The country deserved a full inquiry and a careful report by the Committee, for next time the stakes may be higher.

A Peculiar Way To Run An Inquiry

The Committee has closed its books without completing its investigation and without making a report. It held three hearings in closed session, on August 6, 1964, in May 1966 and on Feb. 20, 1968. Censored transcripts have been released only of the first and third. It tied one hand behind its back by deciding not to interrogate those participants who were so disturbed by the falsifications that they volunteered their testimony. These included Naval personnel in the Tonkin Gulf during the alleged attack Aug. 4, 1964, and personnel who handled the intelligence messages in the Pentagon's command and control center that night.

The Committee limited itself to a study of the documents the Pentagon was willing to supply—and then decided not to release the study even of these documents as prepared by its own Committee staff. Fortunately much of this material was made public by Morse in his Senate speeches last February 21, 28 and 29. With his defeat in the last election, there is no one left on the committee who has yet shown his courage, insight and energy. Gore or McCarthy could fill the void if they really wanted to.

Fulbright promised the Senate last March 22 to pursue the questions left unanswered by the hearing last February. The only result is the documents released as "Part II" of the Tonkin Gulf inquiry Dec. 16 and briefly covered in a few newspapers Dec. 20. Whoever drafted the one-page preface for Fulbright was a master of the equivocal and the opaque. It hides his biggest failure. It makes no reference to the Pentagon's refusal to hand over a command and control report which became known to the Committee through an anonymous letter. This indicated that the President acted on dubious information, and in haste, because he could no longer wait for prime TV time in which to announce the Tonkin Gulf reprisals to the country. The Committee had the name of the man who wrote the report and could have called him as a witness. It weakly acquiesced in the Pentagon's refusal. "The study," as assistant Secretary of Defense Paul C. Warnke coolly informed Fulbright in one of the letters released in Part II, "is not considered appropriate for dissemination outside the Department." Fulbright connives in this bureaucratic cheek by releasing this letter with the other documents not—as his preface says—"to revive the controversy" but "because of the possible historical interest!" In effect he covers up for Johnson at the end of this inquiry as he did at the beginning.

Lunar Voyages and Earthly Lunacy

In the wake of the first manned trip around the moon, what earth needs is a true parliament of man, with power to decide where we go from here. Professor Kistiakowsky, who was Eisenhower's science adviser, called the trip a spectator sport in a CBS interview Dec. 29 and doubted its social utility. The next step, a manned landing on the moon, will bring the cost to $30 billion (he estimated) and a manned flight to Mars $300 billion. The Russians are spending comparable sums in the space race. Have the two superpowers the right to pour out so much of man's wealth, energy, ingenuity and resources on stunts in outer space when more than half mankind scratches out a miserable ill-fed existence, and faces famine before the end of the century? In the U.S., aerospace has become our biggest manufacturing industry, employing nearly half our scientists and engineers, thriving on the arms race and the space race. It is the biggest gravy train on earth. Is there no way to mobilize a counterforce?

We Regret That Delays in Britain and the Dock Strikes Here Have Held Up Shipments of "The Haunted Fifties"—Orders Will Be Filled As Soon As They Arrive

FOR STONE'S NEW BOOK

For the enclosed $6.95 send I. F. Stone's new book, In A Time of Torment (Random House) regular price $7.95

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

Indicate if gift announcement wished ☐

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

I. F. Stone's Weekly 1/13/69

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. 20015

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every other Monday at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED